

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

ddress: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Weshington, D.C. 20231

SEAML NUMBERS FLING LANT FIRST NAMES INVENTOR AYYORNEY DOCKET NO. 077630,986 12724/90 COMBEAU 5689 EXAMINER EOX.J SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY 3000 SOUTH EADS STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22202 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3407 04/09/92 DATE MAILED: in a continue coffer from the examiner in charge of votice policelian. COMMISSIONER OF VATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire month(s). days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION are pending in the application. 1. Claims_ Of the above, claims are withdrawn from consideration. 2. Claims_ have been cancelled. 3. Claims 4. Claims _ 5. Claims _ are objected to. 6. Claims_ __ are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _ Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawingsare acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on ___ _____. has (have) been
approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed ___ ____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation). 12. 🔲 Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has 🔲 been received 🔲 not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. __ __ ; filed on _ 13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

Serial No. 630986

Art Unit 3407

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed
publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or
on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the
date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 16, 18-19, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by French 292,316. See Figure 15 upside down.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over French 292,316. It would have been obvious to use a tapered plug in '316 in view of their well known nature.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over French 29,316 in view of Nyder et al. Nyder et

F.

Serial No. 630986

Art Unit 3407

al show a plug valve retained by a groove and flange. It would have been obvious to use such a groove and flange in '316 to simply assembly, for example.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim s 16-23 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to John Fox at telephone number (703) 308-2595.

JOHN C. FOX
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 347

J. FOX:th April 01, 1992

JP-